THE EXAMINER.

No. 271 SUNDAY, MARCH 7, 1813.

THE POLITICAL EXAMINER.

Party is the madness of many for the gain of a few. SWIFT.

No. 262.

THE PRINCE AND PRINCESS OF WALES.

Upon this subject we shall neither be very long nor very obscure; for there seems reason to expect a good many occasions of entering more minutely into it, and though it is impossible to decide upon the case at once, there is an obvious and self-evident view of the question which it shall be our business to bring forward, in default of having a plain statement from the party feelings of the daily newspapers. It is upon occasions like these, when having partial opinions from every body, people are in danger of getting the truth from nobody, that in our freedom from party connections and in our being enabled to consider every question upon it's plainest and broadest grounds, we have always conceived ourselves to be of particular service to the public:—nor do the recent circumstances affecting our condition admonish us to make an exception of the case before us,—for if the PRINCE REGENT has put us upon our spirit to continue the same plain-dealing towards what is wrong in him, he has put us also upon our pride to do justice to what we may find right in him; and should our conclusions still be upon the unfavourable side, we beg the reader, as usual, to pay no attention but to such as are founded on solid reasons. We do not pretend, on this or on any other occasion, to be free from such prejudices and partialities as all the members of a community entertain in some way or other: we only mean to say, that at times, when the political world is peculiarly agitated, we consider ourselves as supplying a place of observation seldom occupied by Journalists, and as calculated, in our comparative abstraction from the bustle and it's *interests*, to afford a cooler and quieter answer than most of them to the curiosity of the reasonable and the reflecting.

In short, what we endeavour to make up for in this instance, is what we should most desire ourselves, were we only readers of newspapers, instead of writers. Journalists seem to think that every body must consider a question with party feelings, as well as themselves, whereas there are multitudes of persons, particularly in the middle classes, who care not an atom for any party strictly so called, and who only desire to see a question treated upon those simple and obvious principles of right and wrong, of which every reasonable understanding can judge, and which, as it is the business of false politics to perplex and obscure them, so it is the business of true politics, or in other words, of common sense and common honesty, to disentangle and bring out. Such persons, without being disposed to cant, or to expect impossibilities and perfections of any kind, grow sick and tired at seeing a subject which affects the moral and therefore the physical strength of such a nation as this, handled as if it were a mere trick of state,—as if it *would* have been of no importance, had not one set of men chosen to talk of it, and *is* of no importance, because another set wish to let it drop. They see it miserably mauled and sophisticated on all sides,—some holding back this part of the question, others holding back that, and all making it secondary to the views of some class of politicians,—and they long to communicate with some plain-spoken writer who has none of these party reservations to study, and who will talk the thing over with them as fairly as if he were sharing the calm security of their fire-side, and making one of a circle, where there was sense enough to see the ill effects of such an example, tenderness enough to commiserate it, and patriotism enough to resent it. Here it is that we would come in,—not with an idle officiousness of scandal, (our own fire has consumed quires of scandal), nor with a worse display of indecencies (we are now suffering for opposing their display), but with a wish to discuss the matter with English sincerity, and while justice is done to all parties, to keep up that fine sense of national manners, and that jealousy of their violation, which whatever may be thought by East Indian statesmen, or Frenchified courtiers, is, at last, the only spirit that shall hallow our island from intrusion,—the only door of oak that shall keep us a sure family within, and dash out the idle brains of the invader.

Let the reader suppose then, that we are fairly seated with his family party,—or if there is some difficulty in such a fancy, now that we have got a certain magic circle about us in the shape of a high wall, let him transport himself to our own abode. We will treat his imagination very tolerably,—stir up the fire for it,—place it in an elbow chair, with a screen at the back to keep the cold out of its neck,—and now that the evening is set in, and the fetters have done clanking, endeavour to make the place about us comfortable enough to be forgotten.

And first, of the mere facts of the case.—Eighteen years ago the Prince of WALES was found to be enormously in debt, and as assistance did not appear to be on the part of his family, and the Parliament, on liquidating his last debts, had been given to understand that he would not come upon the nation again for a similar exercise of their generosity, he was reduced to the very awkward dilemma, either of again having recourse to them without an excuse for so doing, or of continuing to incur obligations, to distress individuals, and altogether to make bad worse, in a manner that had already subjected him to the most humiliating reproaches. At this time a wife was proposed to his Royal Highness, and though, as our present busi-

ness is with facts and known circumstances, we make no conjectures as to the cause of the proposal, not to mention, that he must have married some time or other, and it was by no means too early in the day for a settlement of that nature,—yet it is certain that the Parliament was first induced by it to listen to another liquidation of his Royal Highness's debts;—"stipulations" were even talked of to that effect, as dependent upon his marriage;—and in fine, the marriage and the liquidation took place. Unfortunately, whatever may have been the case with the latter, it was soon understood that the former was not at all to the Prince's mind; symptoms of distaste, whether confined to his side, or mutual, soon made their appearance; and though a daughter was the result of the union, a separation had taken place between the parties, even previously to that event. This separation, which was of a most distant and complete description,—separate houses, no meeting, no intercourse whatsoever,—has continued ever since; but if the young Princess, their child, was no help to a better union, she became the innocent cause of maintaining an unpleasant sense of their connection by giving rise to disputes respecting her residence and education. The decision in this matter was in the hands of the possessor of the throne, and the KING concluded upon an arrangement, which at least shewed a favourable opinion of the mother, by consigning to her the care of her daughter's childhood. Things remained in this condition for years, and the nation had an example before it certainly not congenial with its character, nor auspicious to its hopes. In the mean time, by the death of Mr. PITT, an unexpected change took place in his MAJESTY'S Councils; what have been strangely called the politics of Carlton House, predominated for a time; and the PRINCESS suddenly found her *character* under investigation at Court. The result was a paper signed by four Whig Lords, acquitting her ROYAL HIGHNESS of all actual criminality, but leaving imputations of levity and indiscretion upon her. This was in 1806-7, and the consequence was a suspension of her appearance at Court. The remains of Mr. PITT'S Cabinet succeeded to office in the latter year, and in less than a month's time, under *their* signature, completely acquitted her ROYAL HIGHNESS, not only of all criminality, but of all levity and indiscretion, and earnestly recommended that she should immediately be re-admitted to his MAJESTY'S presence. The upshot of the bustle was, that the PRINCESS was suffered to have the visits of her daughter once a week, and till within a short time since, this regulation remained in force. At length, in consequence of a certain lamentable circumstance with which we are all acquainted, the Prince of WALES became Regent, and strange as it appeared to many, continued his father's Ministers in office. The arrangement was, no doubt, commodious to him in many respects, and strikes us that it must have been particularly so [illegible] on some grounds, because with regard to the PRINCESS it left a stumbling block in the way both of his ROYAL HIGHNESS and his Servants, which threatened much difficulty in the removal. This is proved by events. The PRINCE, acting with full powers for his MAJESTY, becomes the regulator of his own family concerns, and reduces the small number of the young PRINCESS'S visits to a still less. The mother grows alarmed, and finding that a plan of new and unexplained rigour is to be pursued with her, determines upon remonstrance. Her remonstrance, however, which she sends in the form of a letter to his ROYAL HIGHNESS, is made in vain as long as it is made in private, and at last it appears in the newspapers, and creates all the bustle that we have seen. Now it is that the PRINCE and his Ministers feel the inconvenience of their former conduct. The men, who did in some measure appear to agree with him on this family subject, he had thrown at a distance from him, while those, who entirely disagreed, and who were even pains-taking and loud in affirming the complete innocence of her ROYAL HIGHNESS, he had taken into his confidence and made the instruments of his policy.—It is true, when they entered upon office, they came to a general agreement, it seems, *not to wait upon her Royal Highness*, not to wait upon this wife and mother, whom they had warmly advocated, and recommended, and pronounced entirely guiltless; but the task of reviewing their sentence could be no very pleasant one even to such persons. They assembled; they fortified themselves and diminished as much as possible their own abstract responsibility, by drawing about them all the Law and the State Officers they could collect; and the moment they sat down, they sent for a Mrs. LISLE, whose testimony on the former occasion appears to have been one of those which they had pronounced "undeserving of credit." The result is a paper which the reader will see in the present *Examiner*, and which the Princess, justly conceiving it to leave her under unpleasant imputations, declines to consider as reducing her to the necessity of silence. Her Royal Highness accordingly writes a letter to Parliament, requesting a full and impartial trial at once, in order to be finally declared innocent or guilty; and here, in consequence of some previous movements towards a discussion of the subject in the House of Commons, the business at present remains.

In this hasty sketch, we have said nothing of the famous *Book*, or rather *Books* (for there are two of them *) neither have we hinted at the alleged or probable causes of disgust in either party. We have strictly confined ourselves to the most notorious facts of the case, in order that we may see the more clearly how *appearances* stand. Enquiry and analysis are yet to come.

Upon the face then of the business, the Princess of WALES is clearly in the situation of *a person suffering without a known reason*. How far we might think that she *ought* to suffer, were we acquainted with all the cir-

* We take this opportunity of saying, that we have seen only *extracts* from these intended publications.

cumstances, it is impossible to say:—we confess, as we have said on a former occasion, that gaddings about and festive visits on board-ship are not much to an English taste in a Princess, and we do not hesitate to acknowledge, that unfeminine or indecorous manners, if proved, would go a great way with us to make us agree,—not indeed with persons who might have no pretence on their own parts to a delicate taste in companionship,—but with those, who on great public as well as private grounds, would keep a young Princess as clear as possible from contamination;—but in common with others, we do an absolute injustice to the Princess of WALES in repeating even the phrases of an accusation, the proofs of which have never been established. If the Prince Regent wishes to be authorized in treating her Royal Highness as he does in the face of a virtuous and domestic people, let him make out his case; but if he cannot, it is impossible that they should willingly countenance, upon excuses of delicacy, which come with no manner of grace or reason from certain quarters, this injury to a female in such a situation, and see the last grasp of reputation, the best ties of nature, and the surest hold upon public opinion, violently rent asunder, upon no better ground perhaps than an unwarrantable distaste and an impatience of all ties whatsoever. Some persons, it is true, maintain that it is better not, at *any* rate, to bring such matters before the public; and if the thing was a matter of mere delicacy, we should be the first to agree with them; but it is the suppression of facts and truths,—particularly of those that regard the lives and economy of Princes,—it is the suppression of such truths in the first instance,—rendered doubly worse by flattery, that make Princes err as they do, and give rise afterwards to these injurious dilemmas. Besides, the suppression of truth is too dangerous a precedent for vice and injustice of all kinds, and should never pass in a free nation:—it is that which makes truth itself, of all kinds, ultimately unpleasant, and reduces those who would otherwise have been grateful and happy panegyrists to become indignant and persecuted accusers. Be all this as it may, the fact respecting the Princess is still the same; she is *a person suffering without a known reason*, and the Prince, by the same rule, is *a person making her suffer under the like circumstances*. The former too,—not perhaps for that patient delicacy which is a woman's best ornament, but for a strong consciousness, at any rate, of being in the right,—inclines one to think well of her by her frank and fearless call for publicity; while the latter,—of whose delicacy we cannot hear for a moment,—betrays the reverse of such consciousness by eluding the call.

Such is the main look of the case in it's general aspect, divested of all surmise and ulterior enquiry; and being such, it is impossible not to see, that while the danger of enquiry is at least questionable, the injury done to all parties and to the public by withholding it, is certain. The PRINCESS suffers without a known reason, and is therefore unjustly treated; the PRINCE continues her suffering without his reasons, and therefore loses in public opinion; the young Princess CHARLOTTE naturally suffers both in her feelings and mode of life; the Ministers present themselves in the light of mere time-servers, who have not spirit enough to stand by the woman they defended; and the public, all this time, are scandalized in their manners, and injured in their national attachments, by the sight of an example in the highest walk of life, uncongenial with their habits, and fatal to their good opinion of their rulers.

☞

FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE.

FRANCE.

LETTER FROM HIS MAJESTY THE EMPEROR AND KING TO THE SENATE.

"SENATORS—We have judged it useful to acknowledge by brilliant recompences the services which have been rendered us, especially in this last campaign, by our Cousin the Marshal Duke of Elchingen. We have besides thought it expedient to consecrate the remembrance, honourable for our people, of those great circumstances in which our armies have given such signal proofs of their bravery and devotion, and that every thing that tended to perpetuate the memory of it to posterity, should be conformable to the glory and interests of our Crown. We have in consequence erected into a Principality, under the title of the principality of Moskwa, the Castle of Rivoli, in the Department of the Po, and the land which thereunto belongs, to be possessed by our Cousin the Marshal Duke of Elchingen, and his descendants, upon the clauses and conditions stated in the letters patent, which we have ordered our Cousin the Arch-Chancellor of the Empire to cause to be expedited by the Council for the sealing of titles. We have taken measures that the domains of the said Principality be augmented in a manner that the possessor and his descendants may worthily support the new title which we confer, and that by means of dispositions which belong to us.

"Our intention is, as is specified in our letters patent, that this Principality which we have erected in favour of our said Cousin the Marshal Duke of Elchingen, should not give to him or his descendants other rank or prerogatives than those which the Dukes enjoy, among whom they will rank according to the date of the title.

"Given at our Palace of the Thuilleries, the 8th Jan. 1813.

"NAPOLEON."

PARIS, FEB. 25.—Marshal Jourdan having been sent for suddenly to Paris, was confronted with another Marshal in a manner unexpected by him, when a disclosure took place, which motives of policy and discretion obliged us for the present to overlook.

FEB. 26.—The Expose of the Situation of the Empire was presented to the Legislative Body, in the Sitting of the 25th of February, by his Excellency Count De Montalivet, Minister of the Interior.—It thus commenced:—

"*Gentlemen*,—His Majesty has ordered me to inform you of the situation of the Empire in the years 1811 and 1812. You will see with satisfaction, that notwithstanding the great armies, which the state of the maritime and continental war obliges us to keep on foot, the population continues to increase; that our industry has made new progress; that the lands have never been better cultivated, nor the manufactories more flourishing; that never at any epoch of our history, have riches been more spread among the different classes of society."

[Here follows a long account of the state of Population, Agriculture, Manufactures, Commerce, Public Works, Interior Administration and Marine, occupying nearly the whole of the *Moniteur*, and two supplementary sheets.]

PROVINCIAL INTELLIGENCE.

STAMFORD, FEB. 26.—CATHOLICS.—"Of the Petition nothing is remembered, but that it spoke much of fears and apprehensions, and something very alarming."—*Dr. Johnson.*—We last week congratulated our readers on the signal defeat of the intentions of a few intolerant spirits in this town to petition against Catholic Emancipation.—We have this week very little less cause for congratulation—and if their defeat has been less decisive, they have at least gained *no victory*. It is far, very far from our intention to censure persons for expressing their opinions on matters of public importance—we hold it as one of the most inestimable privileges we enjoy, that of laying our complaints before Parliament, and we have ever avowed this opinion: but we must maintain that it is unwise and impolitic for persons to sign such Petitions as the one sent away on Wednesday last—who can give no just reason for so doing, and can form no opinion on the merits of the subject.—Doctor Johnson has said on a similar occasion, that "—— The Petition is handed from town to town, and from house to house, and wherever it comes, the inhabitants flock together, that they may see that which must be sent to the King. Names are easily collected. One man signs because he hates the papists; another because he has vowed destruction to the turnpikes; one because it will vex the person; another because he owes his landlord nothing; one because he is rich, another because he is poor; one to shew that he is not afraid; and another to shew that he can write." The Petition to be sure, was not "handed from house to house"—nor did the people "flock together to see that which must be presented to the King"—neither does it seem that "names are so easily collected;"—for although meetings were convened, walls placarded, and hand bills distributed to every house for this purpose,—yet were the projectors unable to accomplish their designs; and having twice failed in making it an act of the Corporation, they were at last obliged to make an appeal to the voice of the inhabitants, and our readers will perceive how decidedly that voice was against them;—for out of a population which exceeds 5,000, only 160 persons signed the Petition!—the majority of whom, would doubtless, were they asked, assign the same reasons for so doing, which the learned Doctor has so readily anticipated.—They are *plausible* reasons truly, and such as might induce any one to sign a document, whatever its import—and many, we make no doubt, affixed their signatures to the Stamford Petition "to shew that they *could* write"—and that but badly.—*Stamford News.*

On the 17th ult. between six and seven o'clock, as John Lee'son, steward to Mrs. Minton, was returning to Beech Mount in his house on part of Brimy, near Bandon, he was way-laid, and brutally murdered, when within two fields of his dwelling, by some ruffians who had watched him for their diabolical purpose. As soon as their atrocious crime became public, an inquest was held, and a verdict of wilful murder was returned.

Mr. Lawrie, a well known inhabitant of this town, after deliberately pulling off all his clothes, drowned himself in the vicinity of Cawsand, on Monday last. The Coroner's Inquest ascribed the act to Lunacy.—And on Thursday, a young female, in Pond-lane, not sixteen years of age, attempted to destroy herself, by cutting her throat with a shoemaker's knife; but the wound, although large, was not immediately mortal, and hopes are entertained of her recovery.—*Plymouth Telegraph.*

An awful circumstance took place at Milborne Port, on Saturday se'nnight: a woman in the work-house being charged concerning some trivial article that was missing, wished God might strike her dumb, blind and dead, if she knew any thing of it.—About six o'clock she eat her supper as well as usual, soon after her speech faultered, her eyes closed, and before seven she was a corpse, without any apparent cause.—*Daily Papers.*

Some time since a stranger arrived at Looe, Cornwall, where he assumed the character of the Rev. Mr. Whitmore, and by his insinuating address, he obtained permission of the unsuspecting Minister of the parish of Talland, to officiate occasionally in the church. His Reverence turn out to be a vile impostor, and having contracted several debts, decamped. The banns of four couple, who were married by this person, were republished in that Church on Sunday last, and the parties have now the inexpressible *pleasure* of again going through the ceremony.

IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Nothing of importance before this House last week.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, March 1.

THE CATHOLIC CLAIMS.

The debate was resumed by SIR J. NEWPORT, who urged the propriety of granting the claims in various cogent arguments, particularly noticing the Address of a Right Reverend Prelate (Bishop of Lincoln) to his Clergy, which contained, he said, many false imputations upon the Catholics, which Ministers themselves knew were false. It had been alleged against the Catholics, that they thought their own the only saving faith; but those who talked in this way, *if they would read their own Athanasian Creed, would find that this was precisely their own belief.*

Mr. WELLESLEY POLE was an advocate for the House going into a Committee on the Claims.

Mr. PEEL spoke against the motion.

The Hon. T. W. WARD gave his hearty vote for it. Nothing, he said, could be more absurd than to look to creeds, confessions, and articles of faith, as tests of men's principles and conduct, without, at the same time, looking at the living commentary on that dry and literal text, in their feelings and actions. For men are not actuated by the doctrines they profess to believe, but by their interests, their habits, the example and sentiments of those about them. Religion and Law come in aid of the motives of action, but they do not constitute them.

Mr. CAREW, of Wexford, supported the motion.

Mr. RYDER opposed it, urging that no possible good could result from such a measure, as it must end in disappointment.

Mr. MARSH thought differently: and alluding to the assertion that the popular voice was against the measure, said, that of all persons the present Ministers were those who had most vehemently opposed *popular opinions*: they had declared, and wisely, that popular clamour should not influence their actions, and he hoped that the present would be an instance of the sincerity of such professions.—(*Hear, hear!*)

Mr. WHITBREAD, amongst other powerful arguments, observed, "I am not surprised to listen to the immense importance attached to the Protestant Petitions; but with me they do not carry that weight which the number of signatures in any other cause would give them. I, and the country, know the artful contrivances resorted to; the Catholics are aware of the inflammatory publications that have been industriously circulated: they have heard and heard of the discourses and almost *threats* from the pulpit; they have seen the charges written by learned Prelates, written, I must say, *in total ignorance of the subject.* These papers have been spread abroad by persons calling themselves "Societies for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge;" and the people have been induced, and in some places *forced*, to sign these Petitions. The truth, I believe, in my conscience, is, that instead of the Protestants being more adverse than formerly, they are now by many degrees more favourable to the claims of the Catholics.—(*Hear, hear!*)—An Hon. Alderman (Sir Wm. Curtis) presented the other day, a Petition of a considerable size. The child and the nurse were tolerably well proportioned* to each other.—(*laugh.*)—He said, on that occasion, that every person of age had a right to

*Mr. Whitbread seemed to have in his recollection the lines of our great Bard:—

"Fat paunches have lean pates; and dainty bits
"Make rich the ribs, but bankrupt quite the wits."

petition; but the Hon. Alderman ought to have recollected that there was a Petition of a still greater size than this against the Catholics, which, in the recollection of many of those who now hear me, set the four corners of London in flames."—(*Hear, hear!*)—Mr. Whitbread here spoke of the Protestant Union, and lamented that the respectable name of Granville Sharpe was seen at its head: but that Gentleman, he said, reads the *Apocalypse*, where he thinks he discovers that the wrath of Heaven will fall upon these realms if ever the Catholics obtain their claims. (*Much laughter*). Mr. W. was one who thought the Catholics had no securities to give. "As kingdoms," said Mr. Whitbread, "have never been overturned but by the misconduct of their kings and rulers, so the Church, in my opinion, will never be overturned, but by the misconduct of the Prelates at her head. But though these are my opinions, other people may entertain different ones; I am ready, therefore, to go into a Committee to consider if any securities can with propriety be granted."

The Hon. Mr. ROBINSON was in favour of the motion; which was also supported by Sir T. ACKLAND.

Sir T. SUTTON was inimical to the Claims.

Lord PALMERSTON should vote for going into the Committee upon them, and hoped that great advantage would be derived from their taking the subject into their serious consideration.

Mr. HART DAVIS, jun. warned the House to be cautious how they acceded to such a measure, as they would find it, when in the Committee, very difficult to make a retreat from it.

Mr. H. LASCELLES would be as ready as any man to relieve the Catholics from any of the grievances they complained of, where it could be done with safety; but he thought they ought specifically to point out the particular grievance, and what concessions would be considered by them as an actual relief.

Mr. PONSONBY moved an adjournment, and mentioned as his reason, the evident indisposition of the SPEAKER.—Adjourned.

Tuesday, March 2.

THE PRINCESS OF WALES.

The SPEAKER said, he thought it his duty to acquaint the House, that in the afternoon of yesterday, he had received a paper which purported to be a letter from her Royal Highness the Princess of Wales, the contents of which it would have of course been his duty to communicate to the House; but as it had no date, and was delivered merely to one of the door-keepers, he forbore to take any steps on the receipt of it until it was properly authenticated. In so acting, he trusted that he had not interposed so as to prevent, or improperly to delay, the approach of such a document to the consideration of the House of Commons.—(*Cries of, hear, hear, hear!*)—This morning the letter in question was authenticated; he had received a duplicate of it, inclosed in another letter from her Royal Highness, and both of these letters, with the permission of the House, he should now read to them.

The House having signified its assent, the SPEAKER proceeded to read the first letter, which was to the following effect:—

"*Montague-House, March 2.*

"The Princess of Wales begs to inform Mr. Speaker, that by her own desire, as well as in consequence of the advice of her Counsel, she yesterday transmitted to him a letter, the contents of which she was anxious should be made known to the House of Commons; and with that view her Royal Highness now incloses herewith a duplicate of that letter."

The inclosure was to the following effect:—

"*Montague-House, March 1.*

"The Princess of Wales informs Mr. Speaker, that she has received from Lord Viscount Sidmouth a copy of a Report made to his Royal Highness the Prince Regent by certain Members of his Majesty's Privy Council, to whom it appears that his Royal Highness was advised to refer certain documents, and evidence, regarding the character and conduct of the Princess of Wales. This Report is of such a nature, that her Royal Highness is persuaded that no person can read it without considering it to contain *aspersions on her character*, though its vagueness renders it impossible to be precisely understood, or to know exactly with what she is charged. The Princess of Wales *feels conscious of her innocence*; and considers it due to herself, to the two illustrious Houses with which she is connected by blood and marriage, and to the People of this Country, in which she holds such a distinguished rank, not to acquiesce for a moment in the reflections which have been cast upon her honour. The Princess of Wales has not been permitted to know on what evidence this Report has been founded, nor has she had any opportunity of being heard in her own defence. What she knows on the subject was only from common rumour until she received the Report; nor does she know whether it proceeded from persons acting together as a body, to whom she could make her appeal, or only as individuals. Her Royal Highness throws herself upon the wisdom and justice of Parliament, and desires the fullest investigation of her conduct during the time that she has resided in this country. She fears no scrutiny, provided she be tried by *impartial Judges*, in a fair and open manner, *consistent with the laws of* the land. HER ROYAL HIGHNESS WISHES TO BE TREATED AS INNOCENT, OR TO BE PROVED GUILTY. She desires Mr. Speaker to communicate this letter to the Honourable the House of Commons."

Mr. WHITBREAD (after a considerable pause) rose and observed, that the letter which had just been read was of such a nature as could not fail most deeply to impress every one who heard it. It would readily be acknowledged by every one, that it was of the utmost importance, both to the illustrious individual from whom it came, and on account of the information it conveyed to the people at large, whose interests might be eventually concerned. In short, it was of such a nature, that the subject of it could not now be suffered to pass in silence. He had waited for some time after the letter was read, in expectation of hearing some proposition upon it come from a Noble Lord opposite, who was one of his Majesty's Privy Counsellors when the former enquiry on this subject took place,—who was now one of those Privy Councellors to whom a similar enquiry had again been referred,—and who, of course, had signed the Report in question. As nothing, however, had fallen from that Noble Lord, he now rose for the purpose of asking him, whether he intended to call the attention of the House to this important subject by any specific motion upon it?

Lord CASTLEREAGH was fully aware of the importance of this matter; but as the motion of which an Hon. Member had given notice on this very subject, stood only for the day after to-morrow, he did not see any necessity for his taking it up at present. At the same time, he thought it right to observe, that the document which the House had now heard, was likely to impose upon him the duty of making a variety of explanations to the House, on the day when the motion in question came forward. Till then, he should defer saying any thing further on the matter.

Mr. WHITBREAD was not aware that the Hon. Member, who had given notice of the motion alluded to (Mr. C. Johnstone), was now in the House. He rather supposed that he was not; but, however that might be, he conceived that it now became an imperative duty on the House to take her Royal Highness's letter into consideration. It now appeared, that her Royal Highness was totally unconnected with any motion on this subject, of which the Hon. Member had given notice, and that he had no authority from that quarter to such an effect.

Here the conversation dropped.

CATHOLIC CLAIMS.

On the motion of Sir H. PARNELL, the debate on this subject was resumed, and the Hon. Baronet urged with great force the propriety of acceding to the motion. Only three English Counties had petitioned against the Catholics; from twenty Counties there had been no Petitions from any but the Clergy, and from Scotland there had been none at all. The Bishop of Lincoln had indeed delivered a bad political pamphlet as a Charge to his Clergy, which contained a foul libel on the Catholics: and the Rev. Mr. Coates of Huddersfield, had put his name to a Petition, which asserted that they considered it meritorious even to murder heretics. Foul as this charge was,

it was almost too foolish to notice. Gotha, a writer of great authority among the Catholics, had laid it down, that any person who worshipped images was guilty of idolatry, and ought to be cursed; that all persons who believed that saints could be redeemers,—that priests can forgive sins,—that the Pope had authority to empower persons to commit sins, or grant a dispensation to lie,—ought to be accursed; that those who believed such doctrines, or who did not hold them in equal detestation with those who charged them with holding them, ought to be cursed.

Sir Wm. Scott opposed the motion. He thought that the only mode of preserving peace and good order, was to secure the ascendancy of the Protestant faith, and to tolerate the Catholic, without admitting it to any share of political power. He saw no prospect of conciliation, from granting the Catholic claims. The petitions on the table proved, that the Protestants of England and Ireland felt a strong anxiety on this subject. These were the petitions, *not* of the rabble, but of the middle ranks, who were capable of judging of the nature of the question. If the Catholics refused securities, nothing could be done with satisfaction to the Protestants. Where, then, was the use of going into a Committee?

Lord Castlereagh, though he was fearful that there were almost insurmountable obstacles to granting the claims at this period, yet he felt it his duty to vote for going into the Committee on the subject.

Mr. Rose thought no good could possibly arise from such a step.

Mr. Manners Sutton was *shocked* at the indecent manner in which the Clergy had been treated in that House. He disapproved altogether of the motion.

Mr. Robinson called the statement, that the Catholics were opposed by some with mitres *on* their heads, and some with mitres *in* their heads, a gross calumny.

Mr. Ponsonby extenuated the ardent conduct of the Catholics, who were goaded by the efforts of the Government-press in Ireland, which was full of slander and vituperation.—He knew not what security could be asked, which they did not offer. Security was demanded that the spiritual authority should not encroach upon the temporal concerns; but the Catholic swore, that no Pope nor Priest nor foreign Potentate had, or ought to have, any temporal power within these realms.

Mr. Canning argued for the motion. Speaking of the Protestant Clergy who had petitioned against the Catholics, he said, that he rejected the idea that the Clergy of the Established Church had been induced to urge their arguments from motives of self-interest; but he could not shut his eyes so close as not to see, that when they permitted their passions to take possession of them, they became blind to the variety of checks which the Constitution contained for its own preservation, and suffered themselves to be led away by a warmth of zeal which their sacred function did not require, and which the religion they professed by no means stood in need of. Mr. C. alluded to the recent case of the Lord-Mayor of Dublin having appeared at the Bar of that House, and of his having claimed the same privileges which were enjoyed by the Sheriffs of London. What glorious victory did he come to proclaim? He brought a Petition from the Corporation of Dublin against the claims of their Catholic brethren. His Lordship, however, did not come entirely single-handed; he brought over with him another Petition, against a monopoly of the East India Company. Down with the monopoly of trade, said he, but keep up that of religion against the poor Catholics! He was at a loss to conceive with what countenance the orators of that assembly could, at the same time, advance such opposite claims. The object of the present motion was to fulfil the pledge of the last Parliament, by going into a Committee. The objection to it was so futile as not to require an answer. Those who wished to go into a Committee, had been taunted by being asked whether they were all agreed on the measures to be adopted? He understood the Right Hon. Mover meant to propose that they should remove the disabilities under which the Catholics laboured, so far as could be done without danger to the Protestant Establishment, and against such a measure he could see no possible objection. The name of Mr. Pitt had been introduced by an Hon. Gentleman (Mr. Tomline) who spoke early in the debate, and who was in every way entitled to the courtesy of the House: he commenced his most extraordinary, "and, I think (said Mr. Canning) his——I will say nothing more than extraordinary (*a laugh!*) speech, by an intimation of the inferred opinions of Mr. Pitt upon this subject," which Mr. Canning, with no unfriendly voice, told him, he had better have omitted, since the House were equally competent to judge. But many who were now present heard that great Statesman on the 25th of March, 1805, utter such sentiments as these: "I thought that such concessions to his Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects might have been granted to them under such guards and securities as would entirely remove all danger to the Protestant establishment, which might have been a boon to the former,—innocent to the latter,—and conducive to the strength, unanimity, and prosperity of the whole empire. I, therefore, saw no rational objection to Catholic Emancipation." These words now sounded in the ears of the Right Hon. Gentleman. But then it was said, that Mr. Pitt had not communicated this opinion to Lord Eldon. The syllogism ran thus:—Every great and fundamental opinion must be communicated to the Lord Chancellor; Mr. Pitt did not so communicate this great and fundamental opinion: *ergo*, Mr. Pitt never entertained it. (*A laugh.*)

Mr. Bragge Bathurst rose to explain, amidst the most overwhelming clamours for *question*; insomuch that

Mr. Secretary Ryder moved an adjournment, but the sense of the House being to *go on*,

Mr. Bathurst proceeded in explanation, but was repeatedly interrupted by the impatience of the House.

Mr. Grattan briefly replied, and the House then divided —For Mr. Grattan's Motion, 264.—Against it, 224—Majority in favour of the Motion FORTY.

Adjourned at Four o'clock.

Wednesday, March 3.

Mr. Mellish brought in a Bill for for building a new Parish Church in St. Pancras.

COMMITTEE ON THE FINANCES OF THE COUNTRY.

The House having gone into a Committee, Mr. Vansittart said, that a short time before the prorogation of the last Parliament, he had stated that it would be necessary, for the support of public credit, to adopt some efficient method for the restoration of the finances, and to provide some addition to the Sinking Fund for the redemption of the National Debt. But whatever may have been the necessity of such measures at that time, he was happy to say that the necessity had considerably diminished since, by the issue of the most extraordinary campaign that History had recorded. In recalling the attention of the House to the measures which he wished to propose, he should first notice the plan he intended to submit for furthering the redemption of the Land Tax. The principal point which he wished to change was in simplifying the arrangement, as he was persuaded, that if the difficulties arising from delay were removed, and certain formalities dispensed with, the measure would be more productive than it now was. For that purpose he meant to propose, that upon a simple notice to the Collectors of the Land Tax, from the party wishing to redeem his Land Tax, a proportional assessment should be laid on, double or treble, as circumstances might occur, for a certain number of years, and which should operate the redemption of the Land Tax. To that plan, he apprehended, no opposition would be made. Another measure he meant to propose was, that for every additional loan for each year, a sum equal to half the interest of that loan should be raised by additional permanent taxes. The next proposition he had to make related to Exchequer Bills. A great number of these were constantly in circulation, and unprovided for. He intended to submit that for all such Exchequer Bills as were in circulation on the 5th of January in every year, and unprovided for, a Sinking Fund of one per cent. should be provided. To those measures he had another to propose of more consequence, and that respected the change which had been made in the arrange

ment of the Sinking Fund in 1803. His intention was to propose a repeal of that part of the Act which provided that the Sinking Fund should accumulate at compound interest till the whole of the National Debt discharged amounted to five hundred millions. That would create an annual charge to the nation of 870,000*l.* and which he intended to provide for by additional permanent taxes. These were the principal points to which he intended calling the attention of the House, and he hoped it would appear that he had been attentive to the state of the Public Credit in this country. With regard to the Sinking Fund as now constituted, he felt persuaded, that had it entered into Mr. Pitt's calculation that so extensive a war would prevail as had prevailed, that great man would have adopted a different arrangement, and one better calculated to meet the circumstance of such protracted hostility. Since the year 1798, above ten hundred millions had been raised by war taxes; and had not those taxes been borne with alacrity by the public, and provided by them, there must have been an increase of the National Debt to that amount. This was peculiarly the moment to substitute successive and simultaneous reduction, as the whole of the debt incurred anteriorly to the establishment of the Sinking Fund, had been redeemed. There was at present about 840 millions in the hands of the Commissioners, which enormous sum it would be difficult to cancel, without a fluctuation of property; but this may now be done, which would not be the case, if that sum were suffered to increase to the large amount which it must, in time, arrive at. According to the plan he should propose, during the first year the Sinking Fund would be increased instead of diminished; neither would the subsequent diminution be much felt, as the fund, it was known, must, at some time or other, be diminished. He now came to consider the beneficial results of the plan, which, however flattering, should not be listened to, if they compromised the public faith. The effect of it would be, to give to the Government a present subsidy of 120 millions.—*Except the taxes to be imposed to provide for the sum which would be added to the Sinking Fund*, in consequence of reverting to the system established before the Act of 1802, *no new burthens need be imposed for four years.* He proposed to raise the sums required for the exigencies of the State by loans, which would be defrayed by cancelling portions of the stock standing in the names of the Commissioners. It was, in fact, reducing the Sinking Fund; but this could be no objection, as it necessarily must be done at one time or other. This expedient would also increase the facilities of future taxation, as, during four years, seven millions of additional taxes, which must otherwise be levied, would be saved. Mr. Vansittart said, that he felt the heavy weight of responsibility which pressed upon him, in bringing on a plan of such importance; but he had no hesitation in doing it, as the benefits which must result to the country, if it should be found successful, would be most important. The Right Hon. Gentleman concluded by reading the substance of his resolutions.

Mr. HUSKISSON said, that if he understood the statement of his Right Hon. Friend, it appeared to him the most important change in our financial system, during this long and eventful war. He should look at the plan with the anxious wish that he might find it consistent with the public credit; and if he again troubled the House on the subject, it would be after having looked into all the details.

Mr. TIERNEY said, the grand plan of the Right Hon. Gentleman seemed to be to undo what had been done by his predecessors. It was to undo the bargain of 1802. The plan of 1802 professed to give to the Stock Holder greater advantages than he had possessed under that of Mr. Pitt; and now, when the public faith was pledged to this arrangement—now, when the prospect of the accumulation of this large fund had been a part of the premium to the purchasers of stock, that the Sinking Fund should be set afloat in this manner without any kind of permanent arrangement, as the Parliament was, from year to year, to find what should be done. He was happy that they would not be called on to decide on the plan before Monday se'nnight.

Mr. H. GRADY remarked on the beneficial moral effects which had been produced, by the Sinking Fund, in keeping up the price of the Stocks, and was convinced that it would be better than to break in on this fund to augment the taxes.

Mr. BARING thought it was a consolation that the shock to public credit (whatever the effect might be two or three years hence) was not immediate. The plan now suggested could not affect public credit immediately, and he hoped that no delusion upon the subject would prevail.

Lord CASTLEREAGH said, that the proposition was complicated, but after the clear explanation that had been given, and the perusal of the documents that would be supplied, he had no doubt it would be very comprehensible not only to the House but to the Public, and would meet with the approbation of the country.

Mr. H. THORNTON noticed two objections. 1. That by this plan the amount of the Sinking Fund would eventually be diminished, and the funds consequently reduced. 2. That the proposed alteration was inconsistent with the public faith pledged in 1792.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER was happy to be able to remove both the objections of the Hon. Gentlemen. On an inspection of the tables and other documents supplied, containing calculations of Interest and Compound Interest, it would be found that the Sinking Fund would not be at all reduced. As to the breach of public faith, it would be apparent, on inquiry, that the public would by this plan be placed in a more advantageous situation than by the bill of 1792. The total amount of debt would be more speedily liquidated by the new than by the old system. It should be remembered that the persons most affected by taxation were those who derived a fixed income from the funds, and if by the scheme now suggested no new burdens would be imposed upon them for four years, the blessings of thousands of widows and orphans would attend;—not himself for suggesting it, but the House for adopting it.

Some conversation then took place as to the repetition now of the arguments employed on the question of the Sinking Fund in 1802. Mr. VANSITTART admitted that the stockholder, *after a lapse of thirty years*, would be benefitted, but until that period arrived *his condition would be worse* after the adoption of this plan than before it.

Mr. TIERNEY lamented that he should not live to enjoy any of the fruits of this noble scheme.

It was ordered that the Report be taken into further consideration on Monday se'nnight (March 15th).—Adjourned.

Thursday, March 4.

THE PRINCESS OF WALES.

On the SPEAKER calling on Mr. COCHRANE JOHNSTONE,

Mr. LYGON said, he felt it to be a duty imperative on him to move the standing order, that strangers should withdraw.

This notice called forth expressions of disapprobation from many Members; but the SPEAKER, of course, felt it his duty to enforce the standing order of the House, and the Gallery was cleared.

After the gallery was cleared, it is understood that

Mr. BENNETT moved that the House should adjourn,

Mr. BENNETT's motion was supported briefly by General MATHEW, and Mr. P. METHUEN; and opposed by Lord CASTLEREAGH, Alderman C. SMITH, General MAITLAND, and Mr. PONSONBY. A division ensued, when the numbers were,—Against the adjournment, 248,—For the adjournment, 139,—Majority against the adjournment, 109.—The House being resumed,

Mr. C. JOHNSTONE said, that as no Hon. Member opposite had thought proper to clear the gallery, he should not bring forward his motion that night, but would reserve his right of renewing it at any future period.

Mr. LYGON said, that whenever the Hon. Member renewed his motion, he should also renew his motion for the exclusion of all strangers.

Lord CASTLEREAGH said, that the Princess of Wales having thrown herself upon the wisdom and justice of Parliament, he did not feel it to be his duty to originate any motion whatever on the subject. It was, however, perfectly open to any Member of that House, who thought that the Princess of

Wales had received any injustice of which her Royal Highness had a right to complain, to make such motion as he thought proper.

Mr. WHITBREAD said he felt himself called upon to say a few words, after what had fallen from the Noble Lord. He had seen in an Evening newspaper (the *Pilot*), what purported to be a copy of a Report, signed by twenty-one of his Majesty's Privy Council. He must presume that the letter of her Royal Highness the Princess of Wales related to that Report. The Noble Lord had already told the House, that when the motion of the Hon. Member (Mr. Cochrane Johnstone) came on, he should be ready to give certain details and explanations; but those details and explanations he (Mr. W.) conceived would not convey all the information on this matter to which that House was entitled. In fact, the Report itself ought to be laid on the table. He considered it to be the duty of some of the Members of the Privy Council who had signed it, and more particularly of the Noble Lord, who had also signed a report in 1807, respecting the conduct of the Princess of Wales, and which was understood to relate to matters of the utmost importance, to take some step on the subject. Some passages in this last Report appeared to him so ambiguously worded, that they might be supposed to convey imputations of the highest criminality; they were capable of being otherwise construed. Whenever the proposed debate came on, he should feel it his duty to express his sentiments freely; but, in the mean time, he must observe, that having been neither an acquitter nor an accuser, *and certainly not both together*, of her Royal Highness, he was not yet in a situation in which he could, with propriety, enter into a discussion of the subject. He felt it highly important that such documents should be laid before Parliament, to come to such resolutions on this case as it might seem to require.

Lord CASTLEREAGH said he was not shaken by what had fallen from the Hon. Gentleman. If there was any individual Member, who felt what was already known to be of sufficient importance to make it the foundation of a motion, he was quite at liberty to make it. For his own part, he must observe, that he should not make any: he conceived that his duty and obligations, as a Privy Councillor, forbad such a proceeding from him. He should discharge his duty steadily. He had given no advice in this business which he should not be ready to justify whenever called upon to do so by Parliamentary authority. The present Report was not a revival of a former investigation. The question was not one of charge or no charge; but whether the intercourse between her Royal Highness the Princess of Wales and the Princess Charlotte of Wales, should or should not be subject to regulations and restraints.

Mr. WHITBREAD rose again, and read the Report of the Privy Council. He remarked, that the public, though they had now the Report, were yet unapprized of the circumstances which had induced the Privy Council to form their Resolution. It appeared to him to be of material importance to the understanding of the subject, that those documents should be laid before that House. He thought it was hard to throw a slur on the proceedings of the Princess of Wales, who came before that House as a petitioner; and *who had no Privy Council to advise her, and to frame Reports in her vindication.* It was certainly the duty of the Noble Lord to move for the production of this Report, which, if that Noble Lord or some other Member did not move for, he (Mr. W.) intended to do; and indeed he should have done it already, had the motion of the Hon. Member (Mr. Cochrane Johnstone) been withdrawn.

Lord CASTLEREAGH could not suffer the House to separate on this business, with an imputation on the conduct of the Privy Council which did not attach to it. The criminality of her Royal Highness the Princess of Wales was not the object before the Privy Council. In the case of the *criminality of her Royal Highness*, the intercourse between her and the Princess Charlotte of Wales would not have been an interdiction and restraints; *but would have*

Lord STANLEY wished to know, whether his Majesty's Ministers intended to take any other notice of the letter received by the Speaker from her Royal Highness the Princess of Wales?

Lord CASTLEREAGH said, he should give the accustomed notice, whenever he should have any intention of submitting any motion upon the subject.

Lord MILTON said, that as the Hon. Mover of the original motion had abandoned, or more strictly speaking, had postponed his motion *sine die*, he was desirous of knowing whether the Noble Lord also intended to postpone all proceedings on the subject of the letter *sine die?* He considered the present as a very grave subject, and not of that trivial importance which the Noble Lord affected to represent it.

Mr. BENNETT intimated his intention, whenever the Gallery was cleared, to persist in his motion of adjournment. He should repeat his motion, that "the House do now adjourn."

Mr. YORKE expressed his regret that the Honourable Member should persist in his resolution, which would tend to impede the progress of the public business.

Sir JOHN NEWPORT trusted that the Hon. Member (Mr. Bennett) would exercise the power he held of moving an adjournment; and that he would not be deterred by the threats of any man, however high in authority.

Mr. CANNING observed, that the present motion of adjournment he considered highly impolitic under all the circumstances.

Lord CASTLEREAGH trusted, that the House would never be called upon to deliberate on the right of any Member to move an adjournment. The mode, however, in which that right was now exercised, was different from any ever before recorded in the proceedings of Parliament. He would put it to the candour of the Hon. Gentleman, whether it was a proper proceeding?

Captain VYSE observed, that a Gentleman, in making such a motion, took upon himself the responsibility of involving the House in an unpleasant dilemma. An Hon. Member (Mr. Cochrane Johnstone) had declared, that he had abandoned his original motion because the gallery was cleared. He, for one, was therefore determined that it should always be so, whenever this motion was renewed.

Mr. BENNETT inquired, whether, if he withdrew his motion of adjournment, the Hon. Member (Mr. Lygon) would also withdraw his motion for enforcing the Standing-Order?

Mr. OSBORNE recommended Gentlemen, who were in favour of the adjournment, to move for the rescinding of the Standing Order, which conferred the right of clearing the gallery.

Mr. WHITBREAD thought, that the existence of the Standing Orders was essential to the independence of the House of Commons, both of the Crown and of the people. He should recommend the Hon. Mover, either to make his original motion at once, or to move that a copy of the Report be laid on the table.

Mr. COCHRANE JOHNSTONE said, he was anxious to comply with the wishes of the House, and should bring on his motion again to-morrow.

After a cry of *go on!* Mr. COCHRANE JOHNSTONE rose again, and mentioned indisposition as an excuse for his not proceeding till to-morrow.—Adjourned.

Friday, March 5.

THE PRINCESS OF WALES.

After some routine business, Mr. C. JOHNSTONE (the gallery being again cleared) brought forward his motion; and the following is given as a sketch of the debate:—

Mr. COCHRANE JOHNSTONE addressed the House at considerable length. He read the Memorial of her Royal Highness the Princess of Wales; her Letter to the King; the Report and a great part of the evidence adduced on the Investigation of 1806. Upon these documents he commented, and expressed a very strong opinion against some of the witnesses examined on that occasion, who had spoken to the pregnancy and

actual delivery (of a male child*) of the Illustrious Person accused. This testimony, he affirmed, was not only not borne out by facts, but evidently proved to be false by the whole of the evidence, parole, written, circumstantial, and direct. He then noticed the imputations under which her Royal Highness lay; the injury done to her; the danger to the country, and the general mischievous tendency of having charges and allegations like those to which he had alluded, made, and not publicly and openly refuted: and concluded by moving two Resolutions, the gist of which was, to call for the production of the whole papers and documents connected with what has been called the Delicate Investigation.

Mr. JOHN WHARTON seconded the motion.

Lord CASTLEREAGH was called up by the observations of the Honourable Mover, to explain the nature of the circumstances involved in this transaction, in so far as was consistent with his public duty and oath of a Privy Councillor. He justified the minute of Council, by which the innocence of her Royal Highness was declared, and avowed *that no charge of criminality had been established against that high individual.* With respect to the motion, it had his decided negative, as he could conceive nothing more improper than the interference of that House, in a matter of the description which had been brought before them. His Royal Highness the Prince Regent, in the direction of his family, had exercised that right which was inherent in every husband and father in the country. He had the only right to dictate what was proper for the education of his daughter; and it would be most indelicate in the House to interfere with his domestic arrangements.

Sir SAMUEL ROMILLY did not speak to the question before the House, but confined himself to a statement of what fell within his own knowledge with respect to the Investigation in 1806. From what he was acquainted with at that time, he contended that the guiltlessness of the Princess of Wales was established, and that no charge of criminality attached to her.

Mr. WHITBREAD insisted that the Minute of Council by which her Royal Highness was acquitted of crime, and the late Report transmitted to her by Lord Sidmouth, were inconsistent with each other. He condemned the conduct of those who restricted the intercourse between her Royal Highness and her Daughter; and concluded by moving as an Amendment, that the above-mentioned Report should be laid before the House.

Mr. BRAND seconded the amendment.

Lord CASTLEREAGH observed, that the restrictions on the visits of the Princess Charlotte to her Mother might not be necessary, on account of any *criminality* on the part of the latter, but on account of her *liability to meet company with whom it was not thought fit that she should associate.* His Lordship also made a few remarks upon her Royal Highness's advisers, of whose conduct he little approved.

Mr. WORTLEY said, he had as high feelings for Royalty as any man; but he must say all proceedings like these contribute to pull it down. He was very sorry we *had a Family who do not take warning from what is said and thought concerning them. They seemed to be the only persons in the country who were wholly regardless of their own welfare and respectability. He would not have the Regent lay the flattering unction to his soul, and think his conduct will bear him harmless through all these transactions. He said this with no disrespect to him, or his family: no man was more attached to the House of Brunswick than he was: but if he had a sister in the same situation, he would say she was exceedingly ill treated.*

Mr. W. SMITH fully participated in what fell from the Hon. Member; if his sister had been treated as the Princess had been, he should feel extremely sore.

Mr. WHITBREAD, after a few short observations, withdrew his amendment.

The ATTORNEY and SOLICITOR GENERALS, Mr. STUART WORTLEY, Mr. PONSONBY, and Mr. B. BATHURST, severally delivered their opinions: the great Law Officers acquitting the Princess of Wales of any stain of criminality, and justifying the line of conduct which had been pursued on this occasion.

Mr. CANNING advocated the innocence of her Royal Highness, whom he considered as justly absolved from every imputation by the Minute of Council so often referred to. He then went into the argument adduced by Lord Castlereagh, and conceived it would be most indecorous in the House to interfere in the family arrangements of the Prince Regent, who was himself the right and sole judge of what conduct ought to be observed in the education of his daughter.

Mr. COCHRANE JOHNSTONE refusing to withdraw his Resolutions, which he wished to be entered on the Journals of the House, the question was put upon them, and they were negatived without a division.—The House rose about twelve o'clock.

* The child alluded to, was the son of a poor mechanic at Blackheath, which her Royal Highness has humanely taken under her protection.

TUESDAY'S LONDON GAZETTE.

This Gazette contains two Letters—one from Capt. Chatham, of the Hamadryad, stating, that having been fired upon by a large French lugger privateer, he had fired several shot into her, which had caused her to sink,—and not a man on board her could be saved.—The other letter is from Capt. Galway, of the Dryad, which gives an account of his having chased on shore and destroyed a French national brig of war of 22 guns.

BANKRUPTS.

G. Goodall, Heckmondwike, Yorkshire, carpet-maker.
T. Wightman, York, glove-manufacturer.
T. Pinchin, Stockton, Durham, spirit-merchant.
E. Pritchard, Stainton, Pembrokeshire, saddler.
W. Matthews, Winchcombe, Gloucestershire, grocer.
T. Hookman, Coventry, ribbon-manufacturer.
W. Worthing, Shiffnal, Shropshire, hat-manufacturer.
T. Key, Newcastle-under-Line, grocer.
J. Hide, Honiton, Devon, wheelwright.
P. Walthew, Liverpool, liquor-dealer.
J. Crawshaw, jun. Sheffield, iron-master.
H. N. Badcock, Axminster, ironmonger.
A. Jones, Chester, wine-merchant.
R. Redhead, Woodhatch, Surrey, rectifier.

SATURDAY'S LONDON GAZETTE.

This Gazette contains two dispatches from Sir G. Prevost, one dated head-quarters, Chambly, Nov. 21, 1812, stating that the efforts of the enemy at Sacket's Harbour, on Lake Ontario, enabled them to send out, on the 10th Nov. seven armed vessels, manned by the crew of one of the American frigates, with a detachment of troops, for the purpose of carrying the port of Kingston, and destroying H. M. S. Royal George, lying there; but that after many hours cannonade, they hauled off: the dispatches also state, that the whole American force at Plattsburgh, advanced to Champlain, about six miles from the province line, and that they made several reconnoissances beyond the lines into the province, and that in one with a detachment of cavalry and 1,000 regular infantry, under Lieut.-Col. Pike, an esteemed officer, they were thrown into such confusion by falling in unexpectedly with a small party of Voltigeurs and Indians, as to fire on each other, and be dispersed, after losing 50 men, in killed and wounded, without the loss of a man on our side.

The second dispatch, dated La Prairie, Nov. 28, states, that the enemy's operations against Lower Canada terminated on the 22d, in a complete retreat upon Plattsburgh, Burlington, and Albany, where they propose taking up their winter quarters.

Another dispatch, dated head quarters, Quebec, Dec. 17, 1812, details the particulars of an attack by the Americans, on the 28th, upon the Niagara frontier, between the posts of

Chippawa, and Fort Erie, in which they were repulsed with much loss in killed and wounded, and of 38 prisoners, after having taken some batteries, which were soon after evacuated. Our loss was only two men killed, and a lieutenant and two men wounded.

This Gazette also recounts the capture of a French privateer of 14 guns and 51 men, by his Majesty's sloop Apelles, Capt. Robb.

BANKRUPTS.

T. Stevenson, jun. Leicester, Leicestershire, grocer.
W. Stewart, Hatton-Garden, grocer.
T. Richardson, Milton, Kent, grocer.
J. Smith, Eversholt, Bedfordshire, grocer.
J. Hearn, Black Notley, Essex, cattle jobber.
S. Hewitt, Bishopsgate-street, linen-draper.
J. Turner, Hertford, merchant.
J. Charlton, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, baker.
R. Withey, Charter House-street, twine-maker.
W. Montes, Great Trinity-lane, coal-dealer.
W. J. Roberts, Bartlett's-buildings, Holborn, coach proprietor.
W. Jowsey, Lower Shadwell, mast-maker.
W. Gledhill, Jermyn-street, Westminster, warehouseman.
W. Elgar, Maidstone, grocer.
H. Jones, Canterbury, stone-mason.
R. Proder, Monk-Wearmouth, Durham, innkeeper.
D. Aust, Walcot, Somerset, carpenter.
P. Weston, Church-lane, Chelsea, bricklayer.
R. Brett, Salford, Lancashire, common-brewer.
T. Hopkins, Bridge-street, Westminster-bridge, tobacconist.
J. Rothwell and J. D. Chorley, Halliwell, Lancashire, bleachers.
T. H. Incledon, Taunton, Somerset, druggist.
J. Mollison and W. Archdeacon, Cannon-street, calenderers.
T. Oliver, Queen's Head-passage, Newgate-street, publican.
R. Cort, Salisbury-square, dealer.
J. Du Bois, Brixton, Surrey, insurance-broker.

PRICE OF STOCKS ON SATURDAY.

Consols .....58½⅜ | Red. Ann.... .....58⅝ 59

All Letters addressed to the *Examiner-Office*, must in future have the postage paid to be received.

Mr. HOOPER, of Frome, is informed, that the Publisher of the *Examiner* cannot learn who sends the Paper to him: the order was not sent to the office.

T. T., and other Communications, next week.

THE EXAMINER.

LONDON, MARCH 1.

A most curious conversation took place last night in the House of Commons, and has transpired to the Public notwithstanding the exclusion of strangers. Nothing actually resulted, but the strongest and amplest testimony was borne by implication, to the innocence of the Princess of WALES, who was acquitted on all sides, by the Whigs, by the Ministers, by the Reformists, by the Lawyers, by those who particularly value themselves on their loyalty to the Sovereign,—in fine, by every body. The reader will see with particular pleasure, the warm interest that was taken in favour of an ill-treated woman, by the most estimable men of different opinions, by Mr. WHITBREAD, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. W. SMITH:—every one, indeed, not immediately interested in shuffling and evading the points in question, seemed to have brought the best feelings of his home and his country with him into the House. The figure cut by the Ministers and former friends of the Princess was proportionately wretched. Lord CASTLEREAGH complained, in his usual maudlin way, that he was an exceedingly ill-used gentleman, and that his questioners were not only "unfair and unjust, but by no means candid:" however, not a word had he to say in defence of the heaviest charge against him, that of consenting to become subservient to a line of proceeding which he formerly opposed. The reason too, which he gave for the new restrictions upon the intercourse between the Princess and her daughter, was very pithy and sufficing. "When the Princess CHARLOTTE," he said, "went to Windsor, the Prince altered the arrangement under which the Princess had been accustomed to see her, from once a week to once a fortnight, that *less interruption of her studies* might happen by frequent journies to London, and it was not intended to require the alteration to continue longer than during the Princess's residence at Windsor." This is the first time, we believe, that any thing was heard of the *non-intention* here mentioned; but there was no other reason, of course, besides the interruption of the studies,—no personal feeling,—not a shadow of intended annoyance,—nothing like a dread of that consistency in opinion, which others had found it expedient to give up:—oh no, nothing but the interruption of these austere studies, which will not allow of foolish fondnesses between mother and child, and of which his ROYAL HIGHNESS has so high and exemplary a sense! This is the sort of excuse, at which plain old gentlemen in brown wigs and broad-cloth cry Hem! and give a nod or two of the head. It contained however a hint that the new restrictions would be relaxed, and it appears to have been under a general impression of that kind, that so little stir was made towards any regular proceeding on the business, though at the same time that Lord CASTLEREAGH gave a hint of that nature, he contradicted himself by saying, that nothing could be relaxed after the appearance of such a letter as the PRINCESS's. This is another false and sophisticating view of the thing. If it is naturally and morally right that the mother and daughter should be more together, no momentary ebullition of feeling in this way can make it wrong. But the right of the responsibility is again thrown on the PRINCE, and still more heavily: if he had nothing before to shew for his conduct to the Princess, he has now, if possible, still less; and the national feeling, the national virtue and humanity, the security in which England is kept by keeping her national character inviolate, will not allow of this thoughtless sporting with public example. Nothing can take off the eyes and convictions of the people from this plain fact,—neither the attempt to busy them with less important subjects (for no subjects are of such home importance to their strength),—nor imprisonments, even if imprisonments could produce silence,—nor silence, if silence were possible. Men of all parties,—who are men of principle,—are as persuaded of it as the most romantic, or if you please, the most turbulent of Reformists. Hear Mr. WORTLEY's opinion of the matter, who certainly cannot be accused of democratic or revolutionary tendencies. This Gentleman, according to the *Chronicle* and *Times* reports, said on the present occasion, that he was sorry to see we had a family who do not take warning from what is said and thought concerning them, and advised them to do so and to look at the continental Sovereigns. This family, he said, "seemed to be the only persons in the country who are regardless of their own welfare and respectability. He would not have the REGENT lay the

flattering unction to his soul, and think his conduct will bear him harmless through all these transactions. He said this with no disrespect to him and his family: no man was more attached to the House of Brunswick than he was; but if he had a sister in the same situation, he would say she was exceedingly ill-treated."—This was spoken like a man and an Englishman,—bold, feeling, constitutional, having a just sense of the dangers hanging over the Monarchy, without the paltry timidity that would consult present ease at the expense of lasting security. Had people so spoken before, we should not have been under the lamentable necessity of saying what we have: and if they continue so to speak, things must mend, and BONAPARTE will be the first to despair at the sight.

☞

A correspondent informs us, that an Anti-catholic Petition was left for signature at the Watch-house adjoining St. Luke's Church, and a boy of his passing with a truck was induced, by two *gentlemen* in attendance, to sign it, with several other lads! All good theological judges, as Alderman CURTIS would say, because they could read and write. But we question very much whether the Baronet really understands the question himself: it seems to be quite enough for him, that the government oppose it.—CATO the Censor would doubt the utility of such a Senator; for speaking of a very corpulent man, he asked, "of what service to his country can such a body be, which from the throat to the groin is nothing but belly?"

By a recent decree of the Court of Chancery, Dr. LETSOM is said to have been put in possession of an estate in Tortola, of 20,000*l.* per annum, with one thousand slaves.

PRINCESS OF WALES.

REPORT TO HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS THE PRINCE REGENT.

The following Members of his Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, viz.—His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury; the Right Hon. the Lord High Chancellor; his Grace the Archbishop of York; his Grace the Lord Primate of Ireland; the Lord President of the Council; the Lord Privy Seal; the Earl of Buckinghamshire; the Earl Bathurst; the Earl of Liverpool; the Earl of Mulgrave; the Viscount Melville; the Viscount Sidmouth; the Viscount Castlereagh; the Right Hon. the Lord Bishop of London; the Right Hon. Lord Ellenborough, Lord Chief Justice of the Court of King's Bench; the Right Hon. the Speaker of the House of Commons; the Right Hon. the Chancellor of the Exchequer; the Right Hon. the Chancellor of the Duchy; his Honour the Master of the Rolls; the Right Hon. the Lord Chief Justice of the Court of Common Pleas;* the Right Hon. the Lord Chief Baron of the Court of Exchequer; the Right Hon. the Judge of the High Court of Admiralty; the Right Hon. the Dean of the Arches;—having been summoned by command of your Royal Highness, on the 19th of February, to meet at the Office of Viscount Sidmouth, Secretary of State for the Home Department, a communication was made by his Lordship to the Lords then present, in the following terms:—

"MY LORDS,—I have it in command from his Royal Highness the Prince Regent, to acquaint your Lordships, that a copy of a letter from the Princess of Wales to the Prince Regent having appeared in a public paper, which letter refers to the proceedings that took place in an Inquiry instituted by command of his Majesty, in the year 1806, and contains, among other matters, certain animadversions upon the manner in which the Prince Regent has exercised his undoubted right of regulating the conduct and education of his daughter the Princess Charlotte; and his Royal Highness having taken into his consideration the said letter so published, and adverting to the directions heretofore given by his Majesty, that the documents relating to the said Inquiry should be sealed up, and deposited in the Office of his Majesty's Principal Secretary of State, in order that his Majesty's Government should possess the means of resorting to them if necessary, his Royal Highness has been pleased to direct, that the said letter of the Princess of Wales, and the whole of the said documents, together with the copies of other letters and papers, of which a schedule is annexed, should be referred to your Lordships, being Members of his Majesty's most Honourable Privy Council, for your consideration; and that you should report to his Royal Highness your opinion, *whether, under all the circumstances of the case, it be fit and proper that the intercourse between the Princess of Wales and her daughter, the Princess Charlotte, should continue to be subject to regulations and restrictions.*"

Their Lordships adjourned their meetings to Tuesday, the 23d of February: and the intermediate days having been employed in perusing the documents referred to them, by command of your Royal Highness, they proceeded on that and the following day to the further considerations of the said documents, and have agreed to report to your Royal Highness as follows:—

In obedience to the commands of your Royal Highness, we have taken into our most serious consideration the letter from her Royal Highness the Princess of Wales to your Royal Highness, which has appeared in the public papers, and has been referred to us by your Royal Highness, in which letter the Princess of Wales, amongst other matters, complains that the intercourse between her Royal Highness, and her Royal Highness the Princess Charlotte, has been subjected to certain restrictions.

We have also taken into our most serious consideration, together with the other papers referred to us by your Royal Highness, all the documents relative to the Inquiry instituted in 1806, by command of his Majesty, into the truth of certain representations, respecting the conduct of her Royal Highness the Princess of Wales, which appear to have been pressed upon the attention of your Royal Highness, in consequence of the advice of Lord Thurlow, and upon grounds of public duty, by whom they were transmitted to his Majesty's consideration; and your Royal Highness having been graciously pleased to command us to report our opinions to your Royal Highness, whether under all the circumstances of the case, it be fit and proper that the intercourse between the Princess of Wales and her daughter the Princess Charlotte, should continue to be subject to regulation and restraint,—

We beg leave humbly to report to your Royal Highness, that after a full examination of all the documents before us, we are of opinion, *that under all the circumstances of the case, it is highly fit and proper, with a view to the welfare of her Royal Highness the Princess Charlotte, in which are equally involved the happiness of your Royal Highness in your parental and royal character, and the most important interests of the State; that the intercourse between her Royal Highness the Princess of Wales, and her Royal Highness the Princess Charlotte, should continue to be subject to regulation and restraint.*

We humbly trust, that we may be permitted, without being thought to exceed the limits of the duty imposed on us, respectfully to express the just sense we entertain of the motives by which your Royal Highness has been actuated in the postponement of the Confirmation of her Royal Highness the Princess Charlotte, as it appears, by a statement under the hand of her Majesty the Queen, that your Royal Highness has conformed in this respect to the declared will of his Majesty; who had been pleased to direct, that such ceremony should not take place till her Royal Highness should have completed her eighteenth year.

* The Chief Justice of the Court of Common Pleas was prevented by indisposition from attending during any part of these proceedings.

We also humbly trust, that we may be further permitted to notice some expressions in the letter of her Royal Highness the Princess of Wales, which may possibly be construed as implying a charge of too serious a nature to be passed over without observation. We refer to the words—"*suborned traducers.*" As this expression, from the manner it is introduced, may, perhaps, be liable to misconstruction (however *impossible* it may be to suppose that it can have been so intended) to have reference to some part of the conduct of *your Royal Highness*; we feel it our bounden duty not to omit this opportunity of declaring, that the documents laid before us afford the most ample proof, that there is not the slightest foundation for such *an aspersion.* (Signed)

C. Cantuar, Eldon, E. Ebor, W. Armagh, Harrowby, P. C. Westmoreland, C. P. S. Buckinghamshire, Bathurst, Liverpool, Mulgrave, Melville, Sidmouth, Castlereagh, J. London, Ellenborough, Chas. Abbott, N. Vansittart, C. Bathurst, Wm. Grant, A. Macdonald, W. Scott, J. Nicholl.

(A true copy) SIDMOUTH.

In the course of the Princess of WALES's defence in 1806, she set forth the following Letter she had received from the PRINCE REGENT, which Mr. PERCEVAL and his Coadjutors then called a letter of licence:—

LETTER FROM THE PRINCE OF WALES TO THE PRINCESS OF WALES.

"MADAM,—As Lord CHOLMONDELEY informs me that you wish I would define in writing the terms upon which we are to live, I shall endeavour to explain myself upon that head with as much clearness and as much propriety as the nature of the subject will admit. Our inclinations are not in our power, nor should either of us be held answerable to the other, because nature has not made us suitable to each other. Tranquil and comfortable society, however, is in our power. Let our intercourse, therefore, be restricted to that; and I will distinctly subscribe to the condition which you required through Lady CHOLMONDELEY, that even in the event of any accident happening to my daughter, which I trust Providence will in its mercy avert, I shall not infringe the terms of the restriction, by proposing at any period a connection of a more particular nature. I shall now finally close this disagreeable correspondence, trusting that as we have completely explained to each other, the rest of our lives will be past in uninterrupted tranquillity.

"With great truth and sincerity, your's,

"*Windsor Castle, April* 30, 1796. "GEORGE P."

The Princess CHARLOTTE must not visit her Royal Mother's party, it is alleged, on account of *the company* she might meet; at her father's palace she doubtless finds the most virtuous people in the land—neither buffoons, gamesters, nor adulterers—all "chaste as ice, as pure as snow."—We should like to see a list of the visitors of the two Royal Personages.—Colonel HANGER and Lord YARMOUTH and the Marquis of HEADFORT used to be among the PRINCE's chosen guests.—To be sure, the exemplary life of his ROYAL HIGHNESS must have it's due weight in teaching "the young idea how to shoot."

THEATRICAL EXAMINER.

No. 130.

COVENT GARDEN.

IT is impossible for any one who reflects but for a moment on the state of our stage, not to be struck with the dearth of female talent. In every department of the actor's various profession, we find men who can personate their characters, and 'strut their little hour' respectably and even admirably. If we want a hero, what romance-sick girl, with her head full of CYRUS and OROONDATES, would not be satisfied with the living portraits of the two KEMBLES and YOUNG? Is Majesty to be described? Would not BAJAZET himself be content with the portly erectness of BARRYMORE, or the deep mouthed dignity of POPE? What little Miss, at least on the east side of Charing-cross, does not doat upon ELLISTON, that mirror of gentility and soul of elegant whim? If we descend to the lower walks of the Drama, and look for pictures of sport and jollity, of humour and fantasticalness, there immediately occur to our view our LOWTONS, MUNDENS, LISTONS, MATTHEWSES, and a list almost too long to be enumerated. Turn then to the female performers; and with two or three exceptions, what passion, what situation finds its adequate representative? The Royal dignity indeed is upheld with considerable eclat by those astonishing persons, Mrs. ST. LEGER and Miss LESERVE; for there seems to be a pretty generally prevalent notion, both on the stage and among its spectators, that dignity cannot possibly inhabit a less bulk than that of a Chinese noble. But is there one other lady who can personate exalted condition or high passion? Is Mrs. H. JOHNSTONE a heroine, or Miss BOOTH a nymph for the son of *Cato* to love with enthusiasm? "Go and see Miss SMITH, Mr. Critic." Seen her I have, Sir, and heard her too; and my head still throbs at the recollection of her sonorous vociferation. "Surely, Mr. Critic, you are hyper critical: every body allows Miss SMITH to be a fine actress, and some think her equal to Mrs. SIDDONS." Really, Sir, I have not the least desire to enter into a controversy with every body, especially on such an impalpable topic as a matter of taste; but as to the outrageous intimation of the equality of Miss SMITH and Mrs. SIDDONS, I will believe it if you can first contrive to convince me that FITZGERALD is another MILTON, or DIMOND next to SHAKESPEARE, the favourite child of nature. Till then I shall only observe, that Miss SMITH is a very lady-like actress, and seems very clever and intelligent: but I wish her voice was not so loud.

The name of Mrs. SIDDONS thus accidentally arising to our notice, may appear at first to contradict our position of the want of female talent: but that great actress stood alone: she was unapproached and unapproachable by any contemporary excellence, even among the men: imitation could never reach her, because imitation can only catch the manner, and not the soul which gives life and consistent propriety to that manner. Mrs. JORDAN and Mrs. DAVISON are also two performers of the very first rate in their respective habits and characters: but it must be recollected that these are perhaps the only two ladies with the exception of Mrs. C. KEMBLE, whom any person would walk a mile to see on the stage.

What can be the cause of this dearth? It cannot be attributed to inferiority in the female understanding, for the best actresses, as in at least two of the instances just adduced, are decidedly superior to the best actors. Indeed, independently of the equality of talent, the greater flexibility of muscle, and the more lively sensibility of heart, which women possess, seem to point them out more peculiarly for excellence in the scenic art. We must look therefore to some other quarter for the solution of the question, and we believe it is to be found in the constitution of modern society. The education of women (and as *Sancho* says, Heaven bless those who invented an institu-

tion almost as good as his favourite regulation, sleep)—the education of women never contemplates their protrusion into public or conspicuous situations; it cherishes delicacy of taste and reserve of manners; and if it does not eradicate the love of admiration, a passion too useful and too noble to be extirpated from the human soul, it at least directs it to the side of virtue, and even in the weakest and lowest instances, confines it rather to an exhibition of extravagance than to a pre-eminence in depravity. To women thus educated,—and in England, allowing only those necessary exceptions which belong to all general propositions, all women who are educated, are thus educated,—what can be more revolting than to be thrust forward amidst the glare of a thousand lights, and the stare of a thousand faces, to make entertainment for a motley audience, with feelings as various as the ingredients of which they are composed;—to be hissed perhaps by a fastidious apprentice, or what is worse, to be applauded, ten to one, in a wrong place, by a good-natured but indiscriminating country-gentleman? Mrs. Ann Bellamy, an actress of no very delicate character, has in her memoirs given a very striking description of the overwhelming terrors which stupified her at her first appearance on the boards of a theatre.

This being the case, we must not be surprized at the paucity of well-educated women who grace the stage: indeed, we will almost venture to pronounce, that no lady of eminent endowments, and possessing that sensibility which is essential to excellence, has, ever in the first instance, come before a theatric public without the strongest reluctance, as well as the most timid modesty.

It is time, however, to put an end to this prosing preface, and if there is any one of our readers whom it has not lulled into a profound sleep, we advise him to shake off his drowsiness, and beg leave to introduce him to a lady well worthy his acquaintance. Mrs. Campbell has many claims on our attention: the circumstances which induced her to come forward to risk a reputation, earned a long time since and reposed in security, her lady-like appearance, her unartificial delivery and natural manner, gave an interest to her exhibition seldom excited, except by the *debut* of the young and beautiful. Mrs. Campbell can indeed never be a great actress, not that she is destitute of intellect or feeling; she evidently has a correct and enlightened conception of her author, but she wants expression: her voice is powerless, and her face and eye want energy and character. One or two passages in *Isabella* were, however, given with great beauty and effect, particularly the scene before the entrance of *Byron*, and afterwards with him. As we sincerely wish success to the exertions of this lady, we must hint to her a faulty peculiarity in her style of speaking. When she wishes to be particularly impressive, she deserts the natural key of her voice, and assumes a sepulchral tone, such as an horrific fancy might ascribe to a person who has been buried a few weeks, provided such person could speak; but as none but a few German poets, and one English one claim any acquaintance with this species of beings, we beg to assure Mrs. Campbell, that to all else such tones will appear unnatural and offensive. With this error corrected, Mrs. Campbell may become a very pleasing actress, though she can never reach the first rank, and is therefore no exception to those remarks which we have offered at the beginning of this article.

Before we dismiss this part of our critique, we must ask Mr. Murray why he dresses *Count Baldwin* like a Chelsea pensioner, and must thank Mr. Charles Kemble for that noble display of strong passion which distinguished the last scene of his *Carlos*.

FINE ARTS.

ROYAL ACADEMY LECTURES.

On Friday the Professor of Architecture delivered a very able Lecture to a numerous audience, at Somerset House, on the origin, application, and misapplication of the Antæ, Pilaster, Pedestal, Pediment, Obelisk, Pyramid, and Mausoleum, concluding with remarks on some of the celebrated remains of antique Architecture.

LECTURE ON SCULPTURE.

Mr. Flaxman delivered his third Lecture on Monday last, to a numerous audience, at Somerset House. The following is an abbreviation of it:—

When we consider the gradual ravages of time throughout the civilized parts of ancient Europe and Asia—that Memphis, Babylon, Persepolis, Alexandria, and Athens, have been left almost unintelligible; that Rome, "the eternal city," has suffered seven-fold conflagration, that in it in the sixth century, only six ancient statues of repute were noticed, and that for a long duration of centuries, Literature and Science were almost extinguished, we might, if we considered such details by themselves, be induced to suppose that almost all the noblest Monuments of those times—those glorious works that exhibit man in so exalted a rank of intellectual being—were lost for ever. But the reverse is the fact. We find that by a kind of miracle, the most valuable have been preserved, of Sacred Literature, of Philosophy in its different sects, Astronomy, Mathematics, Medicine, and the other Sciences—besides the noble remains of Architecture in Egypt, India, Persia, Greece, Rome, and its provinces, the innumerable works of Sculpture recovered from buried ruins, the ancient Paintings found in Herculaneum and Pompeia—with the profusion of Coins and Gems which enrich the cabinets of Europe, and are still being discovered. Possessed of such treasures, we must acknowledge their abundant sufficiency to furnish principles, to stimulate exertion, and to demonstrate how mind and elevated sentiment overrule manual labour and mechanical skill.

From such copious sources it is intended to supply the present and following Lectures.—After an animated exordium, Mr. Flaxman took an historical view of Greek Sculpture.—About 1300 years before Christ, appeared Dædalus, the countryman and cotemporary of Theseus.—He has exacted the praise of succeeding times for curious mechanical inventions, and for giving motion to his Statues.—Nine of these are enumerated by Pausanias, and existed in his time—one of them was a Hercules, with one leg advanced, holding a club in his right hand—the left covered with a lion's skin.—The character of the figure was rude and barbarous, with narrow loins—turgid muscles in the legs and thighs, and without anatomical detail. Endœus, the disciple of Dædalus, made a Statue of Minerva, which was kept in the Acropolis of Athens.—We have copies from the head of the Statue on the early coins of that city. Dipœnus and Scyllis, of Crete, were celebrated for works of marble 300 years before Phidias.—The attitude of a Statue of Minerva (believed to have been executed by them) was

like the Cadmean Hercules—its features hard and barbarous—its drapery divided in small perpendicular folds, with zig-zag edges;—the whole finished with extraordinary neatness.—Philocles the Egyptian, or Cleanthes the Corinthian, introduced outlines in Greece.—Ardices and Telephanes used other lines within the outline, to express the marking of the body and limbs.—Simon of Cleone, first drew oblique views of the human head, and represented veins, and the folds of drapery.—All these improvements in Painting assisted to advance Sculpture towards the perfection it attained in succeeding ages.—The warlike and unsettled state of society, the uncertainty of property for want of legislation, and ignorance in Science, account for the Arts having made little progress in 800 years;—but the victories obtained by the Greeks over the invading Persians, increased their means, exalted their spirit, and led to their astonished refinement and elevation.—The Athenians in particular exerted their utmost powers in civil and political Institutions, Literature, and the Arts.—Sculpture partook of these advantages, and Phidias, who had improved Sculpture by his previous knowledge of Painting, was employed to decorate the magnificent structures Pericles ordered to be raised by Ictinces and Callicrates.—In the Eastern Pediment of the Parthenon, was the contest of Neptune with Minerva, for the patronage of Athens;—in the Western, Minerva introduced to the Gods.—The interior of this Temple, as well as that of Theseus, was adorned with magnificent Basso-relievos.—The principal Statues by Phidias, the Minerva of the Acropolis, thirty-nine feet high, and the Jupiter Olympius, esteemed one of the wonders of the world, sixty feet high, both of ivory and gold.—Thucidides mentions a Statue of Minerva, whose decorations were worth 60,000*l.* a sum equal to all the money expended by our Government for twenty years past in monuments to our warriors.—The most celebrated Statue by Alcamenes was the Venus Aphrodite,—of Praxiteles, who excelled in grace and beauty, the Venus of Cnidus, and that of Cos, the Cupid, Satyr, and Bacchus leaning on a Faun,—of Myron, a Discobolus,—a Discobolus by Naucydes,—a wounded Man by Ctesilas,—the Hermaphrodite by Polycles, one of the most graceful and delicate Statues of antiquity,—Apollo Philesius by Canachus,—the Apollo Belvidere, the Deliverer from Evil, by Calamis,—the Venus de Medicis, believed to have had its origin from a Statue by Praxiteles, and was such a favourite among the Greeks and Romans, that 700 repetitions of it have been noticed by travellers.—The family of Niobe and her children by Scopas, are pathetic examples of heroic beauty.—The group of Laocoon by Apollodorus, Athenodorus, and Agesander of Rhodes, and of which there were numerous repetitions on coins, is an example of paternal and filial anguish in the heroic character. It was produced subsequently to the time of Alexander, as was the Venus de Medicis.—Zethus and Amphion tying Circe to the Bull's horns, was the work of Apollonices and Tauriscus, also of Rhodes.—The Cupid and Psyche was produced after the reign of Augustus, when the Pythagorean Philosophy was revived, and represents the union of soul and body.—In these, and many other groups noticed, existed the beauty, sentiment, and sublimity of Grecian Art.—Athens and Rhodes were the principal Schools of Sculpture. This Art did not materially decline before the reigns of the Antonines.—The Etruscan Art was entirely colonial Greek.—Many beautiful Casts and Drawings of the principal works mentioned were exhibited.

The Professor displayed a very extensive and rich fund of Historical and Critical knowledge of his charming Art; such a knowledge indeed, as is naturally expected from an Artist whose best works are considered by the most competent judges to be so true to nature, to science, to classical refinement, and impassioned feeling, that the polished Athenian, in the time of Phidias himself, would have been gratified by their inspection.

Mr. Linnel's picture, in the British Institution, of *the Gravel Pits*, is a landscape of first-rate merit. It is nature presented in its most agreeable and lively aspect as far as regards so novel and difficult a subject. In this commendation, we except the degree of harshness in the too strong contrast of the yellow ground with the bright blue sky, which might, however, be easily corrected by throwing in one bluish tint into a little water in the landscape, and upon the dresses of the figures, and by softening down the deep blue sky with a few yellow-tinted clouds, thus observing the advice of the celebrated painter, L. Da Vinci. "If you would have the neighbourhood of one colour give a grace to another, imitate nature, and do that with your pencil which the rays of the sun do on a cloud in forming a rainbow where the colours fall sweetly into each other, without any harshness in their extremes." R. H.

THE CATHOLICS.

TO THE PROTESTANTS OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

(Concluded from last week.)

IX. Having had frequent occasion to mention in these columns the answers of the Foreign Universities to certain questions, proposed to them by the direction of Mr. Pitt, the reader will probably wish to be better informed of the circumstances attending the transaction.

In the year 1788, the Committee of the English Catholics waited on Mr. Pitt, respecting their application for a repeal of the penal laws. He requested to be furnished with authentic evidence of the opinions of the Roman Catholic Clergy, and the Roman Catholic Universities abroad, "on the existence and extent of the "Pope's dispensing power." Three questions were accordingly framed, and submitted to his approbation. As soon as it was obtained, they were sent to the Universities of Paris, Louvain, Alcala, Douay, Salamanca, and Valladolid, for their opinions. The questions proposed to them were—

1. Has the Pope, or Cardinals, or any Body of Men, or any Individual of the Church of Rome, any Civil Authority, Power, Jurisdiction, or Pre-eminence, whatsoever, within the Realm of England?

2. Can the Pope, or Cardinals, or any Body of Men, or any Individual of the Church of Rome, absolve or dispense with his Majesty's Subjects from their Oath of Allegiance, upon any pretext whatsoever?

3. Is there any principle in the Tenets of the Catholic Faith, by which Catholics are justified in not keeping Faith with Heretics, or other Persons differing from them in Religious Opinions, in any Transaction, either of a public or a private nature?

The Universities answered unanimously—

1. That the Pope, or Cardinals, or any Body of Men, or any Individual of the Church of Rome, has not any Civil Authority, Power, Jurisdiction, or Pre-eminence whatsoever, within the Realm of England.

2. That the Pope, or Cardinals, or any Body of Men, or any Individual of the Church of Rome, cannot absolve or dispense with his Majesty's Subjects from their Oath of Allegiance, upon any pretext whatsoever.

3. That there is no principle in the Tenets of the Catholic

Faith, by which Catholics are justified in not keeping Faith with Heretics, or other Persons differing from them in Religious opinions, in any transactions either of a public or a private nature.

Nothing can be more explicit than the answers of the Foreign Universities—some of them express perfect wonder, that such questions should be proposed to them by a nation that glories in her learning and discernment.

As soon as the opinions of the Foreign Universities were received, they were transmitted to Mr. Pitt. But the Roman Catholics wish it to be most distinctly understood, that it was for his satisfaction, not their's, that these opinions were taken. Assuredly, his Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects did not want the wisdom of Foreign Universities to inform them, that his Majesty is the lawful Sovereign of all his Roman Catholic subjects, and that by every divine and human law his Roman Catholic subjects owe him true, dutiful, active, and unreserved allegiance.

The originals of these questions and of the answers to them, with the notarial authentications of them, have been produced in the House of Commons by Sir John Cox Hippisley. They are in the custody of the writer of these columns, and are open to the inspection of every person who wishes to inspect them.

X. It is also objected to the Roman Catholics, that it is an article of their faith, or, at least, that they consider it to be lawful to persecute Heretics for their religious opinions. All this the Roman Catholics most explicitly deny, and they consider it is completely denied in the solemn disclaimers made by them in all their oaths, of the direct or indirect right of the Pope or the Church to temporal power; as without temporal power persecution cannot subsist.

They admit that many persons of their communion, both ecclesiastic and secular, have, at different times, been guilty of the crime of religious persecution; but they blame the conduct of those persons as severely as it is blamed by their Protestant brethren. They also plead a tremendous set off. The massacre at Paris, on St. Bartholomew's day, was most horrid; but it had been preceded by the atrocities, full as horrid, of the Anabaptist Protestants at Munster. To the burnings in the reign of Queen Mary, the Catholics oppose the executions of Priests in the reigns of Queen Elizabeth, and the three first Princes of the House of Stuart: they apprehend, that more cannot be said against the revocation of the edict of Nantes than against the deprivation of 2000 Presbyterian Ministers of their livings, by the Act of Uniformity. They also bring into account Oates's plot; the sentence of death passed on Servetus for errors against the Trinity, through the influence of Calvin, his execution, and the justification of it by two of the principal pillars of the Reformed Church, Melancthon and Beza. Between these enormities, it is not easy, in all events, to strike a balance; but the Roman Catholic may justly ask, by what principle of justice, or by what fair course of reasoning, the Protestant is authorised to ascribe the instances of persecution, which he proves on Roman Catholics, to a principle of the Roman Catholic Creed? unless he allows, at the same time, that the instances of persecution which the Catholic proves in the Protestant Church are equally attributable to some principle of the Protestant Creed. —"Brother, Brother, (says two known characters on the stage), we have both been in the wrong."—Let us learn wisdom from them; let us no more upbraid one another with our common failings; let us forget and forgive, bury all past animosities in oblivion, shake hands, and be friends. This is the only rational mode of closing this—by far the most disgusting and disgraceful part of all our controversies.

XI. Another charge is brought against us by our adversaries, in consequence of the Doctrines imputed to us respecting Sacerdotal Absolution. We are said to believe that the mere absolution of a Priest, without any thing on our part, is a full remission of sin. In answer to this we shall only transcribe the following passages from the Book of Prayers for the use of Catholics serving in fleets and armies.—"You know, from the Catechism you have learnt, and the Books of Catholic instruction you have read, that the absolution of a Priest can be of no benefit to you, unless you be duly disposed to a reconciliation with your offended God by true faith, by a sincere sorrow for all your sins, by a firm resolution never to commit them again, and by a willingness to satisfy God and your Neighbour also, as far as justice requires. Without those dispositions on your part, the act of the Priest would not be ratified in Heaven; you would be guilty of the profanation of the Sacrament of Penance, and provoke the indignation of the Almighty instead of obtaining his mercy."

It is not a little remarkable, that a Canon of the English Church, in 1608, enjoining the Priest not to make known to any one what had been revealed to him, bears such a similitude to the Roman Catholic doctrine on this head, that when it was produced in the House of Commons, Mr. Wilberforce interrupted him by saying, that it was a Canon, not of the English but of the Romish Church, and expressed his astonishment when Sir John Hippisley shewed it to be one of the most recent Canons which has been formed for the government of the Established Church.

XII. One of the objections most strongly urged against the Roman Catholics, is the tenet imputed to them, that none are saved out of their communion.

I beg leave not to enter into a discussion of this objection, as it cannot be urged to us by a Protestant of the Established Church of England, as the Athanasian Creed forms a part of her liturgy, and he swears that our doctrine of transubstantiation is damnable; or by a Protestant of the Established Church of Scotland, as the Protestants of that Church, in their Profession of Faith, of 1568, says, that "out of the Church there is neither life nor everlasting happiness;" or by a Protestant of the French Huguenot Church, as in their Catechism, on the 10th Article of the Creed, they profess that "out of the Church there is nothing but death and damnation."

XIII. This leads us to observe, that passages are often cited from the works of Roman Catholic writers, which express, that the Roman Catholic religion has always been the same; and that those who say, that the modern Roman Catholics differ in one iota from their predecessors, either deceive themselves or wish to deceive others. These passages have been cited to prove, that whatever doctrine any Pope or any ecclesiastical body, or any writer of approved authority, maintained or sanctioned by those practices in former times, is universally approved of by the modern Catholics: but this is a very unjust perversion of the meaning of the writers from whose writings the passages which we have cited, or passages of a similar import, are cited. Not one of them approves of any act of temporal power which the Pope or any body of churchmen have ever claimed in right of their spiritual character. In the cited passages the writers mean to assert no more than that the faith and essential discipline of Roman Catholics have always been what they now are. But they admit that the resort of the Popes, or of any other ecclesiastics to temporal power, for effecting the object of their spiritual commission, was not only no part of the faith or essential discipline of the Church, but was diametrically opposite to its faith and discipline. The passages, therefore, to which we allude, can never be brought to prove the position for which they are quoted. To urge them for such a purpose, is evidently a gross perversion of their meaning.

XIV. Such, then, being the Charges brought against the Roman Catholics by their adversaries, and such being the Defence made by the Roman Catholics to them, will not every candid Protestant admit, that the unfavourable opinion, which some still entertain of the civil and religious principles of Roman Catholics, is owing, in a great measure, to prejudice.

But we have the satisfaction to find, that the prejudice against us decreases rapidly. With the mildness and good sense which distinguishes his respectable character, the Earl of Liverpool thus expressed himself, in his speech in the debate of the House of Lords, on the Petition presented by the Irish Catholics in 1810—"I have heard allusions made this night to doctrines, which I do hope no man now believes the Catholics to entertain; nor is there any ground for an opinion that the question is opposed under any such pretence. The explanations which have been given on this head, so far as I know, are con-

pletely satisfactory, and the question as it now stands, is much more narrowed than it was on a former discussion." (See his Lordship's Speech, printed and published by Keating and Booker.) How very little beyond this declaration, and a Legislative enactment in consequence of it, do the Roman Catholics solicit!

CHARLES BUTLER.

Lincoln's Inn, Feb. 5, 1813.

LAW.

COURT OF KING'S BENCH, GUILDHALL,

Friday, March 5.

THE KING v. HENRY WHITE, JUN. PROPRIETOR OF THE INDEPENDENT WHIG.

This was an information filed by his Majesty's Attorney General against the defendant, for a gross, scandalous, and wicked libel, published on the 30th of August, 1812, and on the 27th of September, reflecting on the character of his Royal Highness the Duke of Cumberland. To which information the defendant pleaded not guilty.

Sir WILLIAM GARROW observed, that it was quite out of the necessity of the case, at this enlightened period, to descant upon the doctrine of libel, or to attempt a definition of the offence. The Jurors were men of the world, and knew, that if one man maliciously slanders another, with the intention of depriving him of his good name, that was libel. In the case which they then had to inquire into, they would find that this was a prosecution for an offence of that description, wherein one man has libelled another, and that most atrociously, and with the intent too of depriving that other of his good name. He had long and often heard of cases of libel; but any thing so base as the present, he never knew. The Gentlemen of the Jury would understand that the object of this slanderous libel was no other than one of the sons of the Monarch, his Royal Highness the Duke of Cumberland, and the subject of it was the circumstance of the attempt made by a desperate menial in his service, to assassinate him, and whose self-destruction was the consequence of it. Here the Learned Solicitor-General enumerated the facts respecting that horrible attempt, in which his Royal Highness was miraculously saved from destruction. He then proceeded to state the libel, the purport of which was, that Sellis, the assassin, did not fall by his own hand, but that he was slain by another (meaning the Duke himself.)

Mr. SCARLETT addressed the Court for the defendant. He urged that no inuendo could be drawn from the alleged libel, whereby any imputation could be cast upon the Duke of Cumberland, to the effect which the information set forth. It did not follow (even if it were true that Sellis had not committed suicide), that therefore the Duke of Cumberland had caused his death. All he contended the publication meant, was merely that rumours had announced some suspicions that Sellis did not destroy himself; but it never went to the length of asserting that the Royal Duke was privy to his destruction; on the contrary, it merely so stated the rumour, and expressed nothing that could give it the colour of imputing so foul an act to that Illustrious Personage, and he therefore denied that the Solicitor-General was warranted in giving inuendoes in the publication which it did not in his judgment convey; but he admitted that the Jurors were the proper judges of that fact. To illustrate this reasoning, he appealed to several intermediate publications of that paper, all of which went to demonstrate, that so far from imputing such an act to the Duke of Cumberland, they were all so many arguments to assert the honour and purity of that Royal personage.

Sir WM. GARROW now replied.

Lord ELLENBOROUGH then addressed the Jury, dwelling in strong terms on the atrocity of the libel in question, which, he thought, it was impossible not to apply to the Duke of Cumberland. The tyrannic despotism here assumed exceeded every thing he had ever heard or read of; and sooner would he submit to the domineering sway of the Despot of France, than to this more degrading and more despotic tyranny assumed over the rights and feelings of individuals by such Journalists as the present Defendant. What was the case of the Duke of Cumberland to day, might, in their humbler walk, be the case of any one of them to-morrow.

The Jury, without retiring, immediately found the Prisoner —*Guilty*.

ACCIDENTS, OFFENCES, &c.

On Wednesday week, a poor child, of the name of George Edwards, about 12 years old, was observed sitting at the door of the Dundee Arms public-house, Bethnal Green, by a Serjeant of the West London Militia, literally in a state of starvation. The man very humanely took him home and fed him. On the following morning, Mr. Carruthers, Surgeon of the second Tower Hamlets Militia, saw the child, and desired it to be taken to Worship-street Police Office. The Magistrate ordered the mother-in-law of the child to be apprehended, which she was; and she has since been committed. From the 25th ult. Mr. Carruthers has kept the poor child in the Hospital of the 2d T. H. M., and has attended it with the greatest kindness. The child is recovering, but a greater object was never seen, and no doubt one or two days more neglect would have put an end to its misery. The treatment, as the child states, he received from his inhuman mother-in-law, was truly barbarous, she frequently beating it about the head in the most brutal manner, which its blackened eyes testify.

On Thursday night a tall man, genteelly dressed, was found hanging on the iron rails of Earl Spencer's Garden, near the Green Park. He had hung himself with a new cord. In the agonies of death he had kicked the loose stones which were under him, to a considerable distance. The body was taken to the nearest public-house to be owned.

BIRTHS.

On Tuesday last, Mrs. M'Farren, of a son.

MARRIAGES.

On Thursday, at Wimbledon, the Hon. William Henry Lyttleton, M. P. brother to Lord Lyttleton, to the Right Hon. Lady Sarah Spencer, eldest daughter of Earl Spencer.

On Thursday, the 25th ult. at St. Mary's, Newington, Thomas Bridges, Esq. of the Post-office, to Miss Barry, of Walworth.

On Wednesday, Mr. Carr, of Drury-lane Theatre, to Miss Sawyer, eldest daugeter of Mr. Sawyer, of Somers' Town.

DEATHS.

In Portugal, Lieut.-Gen. Sir W. Erskine, Commander-in-Chief of the Cavalry under the orders of Sir Rowland Hill. In a fit of delirium, Sir William threw himself out of the upper window of a house where he was quartered, and was killed on the spot.

On Friday morning, at Shooter's Hill, the Right Hon. the Countess of Carnarvon.

On Monday, John Claridge, Esq. in Portland-road, in the 81st year of his age.

On the 17th ult. at Sandhurst, near Bagshot, Anne Charlotte, wife of Ninian Bruce, Esq. Surgeon to the Royal Military College.

On Tuesday, Mr. John Skull, of Pentonville, 52 years clerk in the house of Messrs. Barclay's, Lombard-street.

On Friday week, at Burrow's-buildings, Blackfriars-road, Sarah, the wife of Mr. Edward Woodgate.

On Monday, at Brighton, aged two years and eight months, Mary Hammond Solly, the only child of Samuel Reynolds Solly, Esq. of Serge-hill, Herts.

On the 12th ult. at Barnet, after a few days illness, aged 80, Mrs. Charlotte Maddocke, relict of the late Richard Maddock, Esq. many years Clerk of the Assize of the Western Circuit, and only surviving child of the late John Matthews, Esq. Secondary of the Crown Office.

Printed and published by JOHN HUNT, at the EXAMINER Office, 21, Maiden-Lane, Covent-Garden. Price 2½d.